

to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 10029. A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.J. Res. 927. Joint resolution designating the 5-day period beginning September 21, 1964, as "Licensed Practical Nurse Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 928. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve, foster, and protect our Nation's spiritual heritage and deep-rooted dependence on Divine guidance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 628. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to declare the right of the House of Representatives to determine the qualifications of its Members; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 629. Resolution declaring the intent of the House of Representatives to retain its right to determine the qualifications of its own Members; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 630. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Serv-

ice to conduct an investigation and study of solicitations of certain contributions of Government employees for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10030. A bill for the relief of Demijohn D. Downer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 10031. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga I. Sazdova and minor children, Zaneta Sazdova and Elisabeta Sazdova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 10032. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Condon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10033. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10034. A bill for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10035. A bill for the relief of Francisco Mougruza Fortea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

707. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to send to all teachers copies of "Reports To Be Made to Congress" as aids in teaching government and history; to the Committee on House Administration.

708. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to pass a commendatory resolution for the Supreme Court relative to its February 17, 1964, decision requiring congressional districts to reapportion on an equal population basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

709. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to ask the American people to ring bells and blow whistles for 3 minutes at noon March 4, 1964, to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

710. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Kearney County T-Bone Club of Minden, Nebr., objecting to the amount of imported beef, resolving that imports be reduced to not more than 5 percent of domestic consumption, resolving that members of the Kearney County T-Bone Club pledge themselves to not feed cattle to weights over 1,150 pounds, urging all cattle feeders to refrain from feeding cattle to over 1,150 pounds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Johnson-Home Communique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I voice the sentiment of this Chamber in hailing the recent Johnson-Home communique. Its tone of quiet confidence was a source of encouragement. It reflected an air of comity and candor. It revealed proven and tested allies working toward the attainment of common goals.

It was the first opportunity of President Johnson and Prime Minister Douglas-Home for a working meeting since they assumed the leadership of their respective Governments. But it followed in the high tradition of Wilson and Lloyd George, Roosevelt and Churchill, Kennedy and Macmillan.

Both men saluted the test ban accord, and at the same time reaffirmed their intent to search out other ways of reducing tension, of banishing the risks of war, of lifting the crushing burden of armament. In particular the Prime Minister welcomed the proposals made to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference by the United States in President Johnson's message of January 21.

Both leaders pledged their full support to the United Nations.

The President and the Prime Minister affirmed our common hopes, aims, and aspirations in Southeast Asia. The Prime Minister reemphasized the United

Kingdom's support for the U.S. policy in South Vietnam. The President reaffirmed the support of the United States for the peaceful national independence of Malaysia.

But they found peace alone an inadequate goal. They sought it as a necessary precondition for expanding international trade and promoting economic growth for all to the end that all peoples of this world may live out their days free from the shroud of fear and the specter of want.

An Address by the Honorable John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at the Annual Dinner of the Maryland Association for Mental Health, February 11, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the problem of meeting the needs of the mentally ill has become more visible in recent years. The neglect of the past has been replaced with new opportunities for the care and prevention of mental illness. Recently my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, gave a talk on this timely subject before the annual dinner of the Maryland Association for Mental Health

on February 11, 1964. Under previous permission I place the text of his excellent remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH, FEBRUARY 11, 1964

I feel very much at home here in Maryland among you who share with me concern for the mental health of our citizens. You who have had it in your hearts to join this gathering now have it in your hands to bring to your State a new era of promise for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded toward which we have labored so long.

We meet together at a time of great momentum in our Nation's drive against the mental illnesses. The community mental health centers program envisioned in recent Federal legislation, and toward which you are already planning in your mental health services, is a consummation of a nationwide effort, of two decades of study and work.

It is to this new opportunity I would like us to address ourselves this evening.

Mental health care today concerns every city and community and State in the country. This point has been made indelibly clear to us in Congress. I am sure it is just as clear to you, and that you in the Commonwealth of Maryland, who are no strangers to bold pioneering, will continue the vital planning, the action essential to breaking from the dreary patchwork of old ways.

We can look back to the days—the not-so-far-distant days—when the locked ward, the bolted door, and the barred window were our major gifts to the mentally ill; when they were regarded, if regarded at all, as inmates in the safe custody of State asylums.

Today the large, isolated asylum is as archaic as the last vestige of the narrow, one-lane roads we see beside our superhighways, the pock-marked relics which lead from nowhere to nowhere.

Indeed, no field of public health has undergone more radical change than the care and prevention of the mental illnesses. It continues to undergo change. In the last two decades, our ability to treat the mentally troubled and our capacity to prevent mental disorders have been greatly accelerated. Steadily, our sole reliance on the mental hospital has diminished. Steadily, the very nature of the mental hospital itself has changed. We have begun to deal significantly with the mental health of our citizens in terms of our own time and knowledge, and not of some past century.

Today we are far better prepared to give help to our people as they live in the communities of our affluent land. We can give help to the disturbed child, the unhappy adolescent, the troubled new mother. We can give help to the chronic alcoholic and the mentally retarded. We can give help to our growing number of elderly citizens. A vast inheritance of knowledge and dedication has prepared us. Now let us move forward to provide that help on a broad scale.

When I began my service on the House Appropriations Subcommittee 17 years ago, it may have seemed a poor risk to many to sponsor the National Mental Health Act and to provide funds for the new National Institute of Mental Health. But in no field of domestic well-being am I more proud of our efforts, those first hesitant efforts to give national impetus against the problems of mental ill.

For our States and communities can and do advance against the darkness of old systems as they are shown the way. Under the National Mental Health Act, States must match each Federal dollar given for grants-in-aid with \$1 from their own funds. In actual practice, however, the States are doing much more than this. By 1961 they were matching Federal funds of more than \$6 million for community mental health services with \$85 million budgeted by State and local governments.

This fostering of mental health care within the community is reflected in the spread of the Nation's outpatient psychiatric clinics. By 1961, our 500 clinics had grown to more than 1,500, sponsored privately or by schools, courts, universities, general and mental hospitals, charities, foundations, agencies for veterans, public health, and welfare. Today 56 fewer persons per 100,000 population are in our public mental hospitals than there were in 1950, and clinics are treating as many patients as are admitted to public and private mental hospitals combined.

On our mutual journey into mental health research, exploring the barriers of the mental illnesses has led us to other advances in the care of our people. Some disorders previously requiring long care were responding to shorter, intensive treatment, frequently in the general hospital near the patients' families and homes. Today the number of psychiatric patients admitted to general hospitals equals the number admitted to mental hospitals. These citizens are being helped through crises without the indignity of custodial care. This is another promising outcome of our Federal-local team.

And I could cite other advances in the mental health care of our citizens in States alert to the model, the successful new trials proceeding without respite in our common resolve.

In these trials, we have viewed mental health problems as a spectrum of problems requiring a spectrum of services. Many elements combined to remove our old blindfolds, to give us this outlook. One element is the high cost of traditional, custodial hospital care—last year, this was more than \$2 billion. Another element is the buildup of medical knowledge stimulated in trying to find our way past this costly deadend. Another element is our invigorating social insight inherited from the turmoil of the

world's people and the consequent revulsion at public neglect of our citizen's needs.

Thus, the stimulus we have mustered at the national level has stemmed, in democratic partnership, the backwash of stagnant medical care. Extensive Federal grants spurring research in mental health, training workers in mental health, supporting experimental projects, continue. Now they can go forward, with your help, into broad and integrated systems of mental health services.

To this end, the increasing national interest in the mental health care of our citizens has recently provided new momentum. Just 1 year ago our late President Kennedy delivered before Congress his unprecedented message on mental illness and mental retardation. Within months, the Federal Government provided action. Within months, recommendations of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health which could be implemented under the existing law were written into the Federal budget: more funds for improving mental hospitals, more funds for training hospital personnel, more funds for care of the mentally retarded.

And, as a starting point for a new national mental health program, \$8,400,000 was earmarked for nationwide, long-range planning of mental health services. It was an effort and a concept without parallel in the history of public health in our land.

For this planning, each State was first summoned to survey its mental health needs and resources, and to have in readiness channels into every county to insure a flow of participation in the plans. In this common cause, State agencies; lay groups representing church, school, and industry; enforcement officials; medical and social authorities met and still confer. The wide representation in these preliminary moves toward planning has been as unique as the task.

In the fresh mobilization against the mental illnesses, other recommendations to the President were introduced before Congress as new legislation, passed, and signed into two new laws.

One law amends the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation. This is Public Law 88-156. It provides massive funds for four programs. For maternal and child health and crippled children's services, funds are increased by steps from \$50 million a year in fiscal 1963 to \$100 million in 1970 and after. For maternity care projects designed to prevent mental retardation, \$120 million has been authorized over a 5-year period. For research projects in maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, there is \$8 million a year; and to encourage States to plan for action against mental retardation, \$2 million has been assigned.

The other legislation, Public Law 88-164, appropriates, under title I, \$126 million for the construction of research centers for mental retardation, for university-associated facilities, and for facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded. For training teachers of mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and physically handicapped children, \$47 million has been assigned under title III; \$6 million will sponsor research and demonstration projects in the education of these handicapped children.

It is title II of this act, directed to the welfare of the general community, I now submit to your attention. This title provides \$150 million in matching funds for the construction of community mental health centers through 1967. Starting in fiscal 1965, the money is being made available in increasing amounts, yearly, from \$35 million to \$50 million in 1966 to \$65 million in 1967, to give the States ample time to complete their mental health services planning.

It is this act which provides the seed, nurtured by your tending, from which your coordinated mental health services can grow.

If we are about to emerge upon a new horizon of care for our citizens, the community mental health center can be seen as its bright core. For the goal of these centers is the goal of all our efforts—to prevent the mental illnesses, to diagnose them promptly and effectively when they do occur, and to rehabilitate those who have suffered from mental disorders.

Within our counties and within our great cities, the mental health center can be fashioned into an arsenal of our modern weapons against the mental illnesses. These weapons include general diagnostic and evaluation service, acute inpatient service, outpatient service, day-care service, and emergency service available around the clock. We can arm our centers with rehabilitation service, consultation service, services for public information and education, supervision of foster homes and home visiting care. The center can become a place for research, and for the training of mental health workers needed in our ranks. Indeed, the center can be a community haven within which our troubled compatriots can receive a continuity of care. As their needs change, they can move among the appropriate services, proceeding from diagnosis, to cure, to rehabilitation * * * and then, should the need arise, back to treatment.

These centers can perform another great function. As you know, help which we today call mental health guidance has been given to people since times of old by teachers, physicians, and clergy. By providing professional consultation for these indispensable servants of the community, and for lawyers, law-enforcement officers, and social workers, the center becomes part of the very pulse of mental illness prevention.

Since many of you may become involved in developing mental health centers in Maryland—I understand that your mental hygiene commissioner has had the foresight to request again in his budget this year funds to start three mental health center programs—I should like to share with you a few of the points made to our Appropriations Subcommittee when we considered the support of mental health centers.

One point made was that there is no intention of supporting facilities or services which duplicate—though they may extend—those already existing in a community.

Another point made was that the community mental health centers can be started in different ways. Each center can be as unique as its own community. It may function under a variety of auspices: State, county, municipal, and voluntary. Physically, it can exist under one roof or become the focal point of services conveniently located near each other. It can exist also under a variety of organizational arrangements.

For example, in one city, the center may be based at a general hospital. Since most of the large general hospitals already furnish psychiatric care, a day service, night service, and outpatient service could be added all at once, or in stages. Another community may decide that its mental health center should start with an outpatient facility. In rural Pennsylvania, a tricity mental health center established 3 years ago for outpatient treatment has already added a mobile unit, and anticipates expanding its services further. In New Haven, ambitious plans are already on the drawing board for a \$2 million mental health center under university and city auspices. The possibilities are flexible, various.

The one common essential, however—a third point emphasized before us in Congress—is that to participate in the Federal funding, each center must fit within a comprehensive, long-range plan for mental health services, the planning now underway in our States.

Now let us consider some of the challenges in moving forward with the new Federal benefits.

As enacted, the law provides Federal aid for the construction of mental health centers, not for their maintenance and staffing. Therefore, in order to share in the appropriation, the States will have to indicate adequate support and staffing of the centers. We in Congress who advocated Federal assistance for staffing hope now that most areas of the country will be able to provide this needed assurance to get their centers underway. We hope that geographic differences and lack of funds or personnel will not deprive some of our less-well-off States of essential community services.

Another challenge, faced by all planners, including Congressmen, is how to alter old systems while still being, as it were, entrapped within them. In the planning for mental health services, all agencies, and dedicated individuals involved must look beyond whatever special prerogatives they may harbor, in benefit to the common good. Entanglements over jurisdiction, while understandable in such a broad effort, can only block our hard-won momentum. As a legislator, I can well assure you that to gain support mental health leaders must present coordinated plans, a united front.

Whether in Annapolis or in Washington, we legislators want to be reasonably sure that the money we appropriate makes reasonable sense. This, of course, presents another challenge to the planners of new ways.

I commend to my fellow legislators, however, that the public cost of providing more meaningful and more extensive mental health services may prove to be a wise investment not only in greater human happiness, but in budgetary savings in the long run. The results of one study, for instance, has shown that a vocational rehabilitation program for mental patients costing \$53,000 yielded reduced hospital costs of \$449,000, and \$256,000 in annual wages earned by the released patients. Investment in another project, in Pennsylvania, is conserving both funds and human dignity. There the cost of operating a screening center for patients headed for mental hospitals is more than offset by directing many to less costly outpatient care.

Here in your own State, I understand, shortened hospital stays resulting from improved care and treatment has decreased the average cost of treating a patient 40 percent over the past 10 years.

To be sure, as we extend our services the cost of caring for the mentally ill will be met to an increasing extent by the private sector of our economy. Individual fees, individual and group insurance will share the financial burden. But whatever arrangements we make for the care of the more vulnerable among us, we can in good conscience no longer withhold from the public the knowledge, the skills, the promise which science has laid at our door.

In closing, I should like to salute you here in Maryland for the forward advances you have already made in behalf of the mental health of your citizens. These advances you are now prepared to weave into a concerted design of services for the future.

You have moved to accredit your State mental hospitals, and you are still improving them and expanding their service. You have moved to provide more programs of community care. In Baltimore, a new day hospital in a rented building is enabling mental patients to spend their evenings and weekends at home. In the same city, a new clinic for alcoholics is bringing new hope to many families. You have moved to provide for patients discharged from mental hospitals and for the mentally retarded foster homes to replace the environment of institutions, the environment of loneliness.

Within the mental health profession, your many eminent citizens have also provided leadership. The first psychiatric case register in the Nation is recording in Maryland data on the prevalence, patterns of treatment, and final outcome of mental disorders. One of the first preliminary plans for planning mental health services was submitted by Maryland, and that planning is now proceeding.

These are some of Maryland's vital moves, and I am certain there are more. Surely you will be counted among the States traversing further up the road, toward community mental health. From \$1½ to \$3 million in Federal funds may be made available to your State for the construction of mental health centers. With 145 centers across the Nation anticipated within the next 3 years, let it not be said that Maryland failed to build for her citizens.

As we meet in our halls of assembly, let us recall the words of Thomas Jefferson, who said: "The care of human life and happiness, and not its destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

As we meet in our halls of assembly, let us recall our late young President who was to be the tragic victim of the very kind of mental blot he sought to erase: the unseen, untended disorders which rebuke our civilization. Who knows how many untold acts of violence, days of trouble, and nights of misery shall never come to pass because of our present determinations?

When President Johnson included mental illness in his first message to Congress last year, the signal was clear: our Federal Government, our States, and our communities have at last become inseparable partners against the tenacious shadows of public neglect. And in partnership, we shall advance steadily toward new horizons of mental health care. For, finally, we are in view of the shining, indeed, the lustrous reality that all but a small proportion of the mentally ill can achieve constructive living, and that the mental health of our people can and will be strengthened in every city and town in our land.

Farm Programs: Profit Weighed Against Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal, in a February 5 editorial attacking the President's farm message, repeated its now familiar pleas for what it terms a return to the "free marketing system."

The Journal never defines this system, but invariably indicates it is something we can achieve only by going backward. There was, the Journal intimates, a golden age of freedom for farmers in our past that must be relocated and revived. And it usually makes the abandonment of existing programs for supporting the price of farm commodities the first step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, this Journal is widely read in the Nation's business community. In casually casting aside programs for farm commodity price support, it gives no attention to the distress this solution

to the farm problem would cause in both rural and urban areas of the Nation.

In recent years, as a result of technological advances, there has been a migration of farm people to towns and cities. There is another form of migration from the land to the city, however, and that is the movement of farm-earned dollars.

If the Journal wants to throw farm programs out the window it should, in all fairness, warn its most constant readers—the industrialists and businessmen and stock traders—that they would share the cost of such an action and the cost would run well into the billions of dollars.

A recent study by the Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Economic Development shows net farm income would drop by \$5.7 billion—from \$13.3 billion in 1962 to \$7.6 billion in 1967—without national programs to stabilize prices and production of feed grains and wheat.

The \$5 billion loss is tied to the abandonment of only the feed grains and wheat programs—the losses would mount even higher as dairy, cotton, tobacco, peanut, and conservation cost-sharing programs were discarded.

Five billion dollars will buy long caravans of cars, trucks and tractors; will buy thousands of refrigerators, TV receivers and other home appliances and furnishings; will buy rack after rack of clothing and box after box of shoes; will build and remodel homes, and provide jobs in the factories and mills of cities and towns and for the building trades.

Where will the industrialists, the businessmen, the factory workers go to find a substitute for these billions of dollars?

The Wall Street Journal was founded in 1882.

In 1882 one American farmer produced enough food for himself and five others. Today 1 American farmer produces enough food for himself and 28 others. The skills of our farmers, and the productivity of our farms, have made their greatest gains in the years since the early 1930's—years marked by farmer-Government cooperation in efforts to improve farm income. As recently as 1930 the number of persons supplied per farmworker was slightly less than 10. Between 1940 and 1960 there was a gain of more than 15 in the number of persons provided with food by a single farmer—from 10 to 25. Such progress does not occur where free enterprise, free competition and freedom for decision-making by the individual are prohibited.

I do not know what percentage of disposable income American families had to invest in food back in 1882. But as recently as 1939 consumers were spending 22.3 percent of their disposable incomes for food. In the war years the figure went up to nearly 27 percent. In the 1960's it has been around 19 percent.

In 1963, American families had \$403 billion of spending money and they used only 19 percent of it—\$77 billion—for the purchase of food. In 1948, 15 years earlier, they were spending 25.5 percent of their disposable income for food. If they had been required to spend the same percentage of their 1963 income for

food as they did in 1948, their grocery bill would have been \$103 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest part of this saving of \$26 billion in 1963 in the cost of food to American consumers must be attributed to the dramatic increase in efficiency in agricultural production and marketing.

Does anyone believe that a substantial part of this increased efficiency should not be attributed to Government programs? Government research has shown the way to more abundance and more efficient production. Price supports and other assistance to farmers have given them the assurance of stability that is necessary to effective planning and the incomes with which to purchase the machinery, equipment, and technological supplies that have brought about this increased efficiency.

Even if there is subtracted from the \$26 billion saving to consumers in 1963 the full amount of the Department of Agriculture appropriation for the fiscal year 1964—about \$6 billion—this still leaves a clear saving to American consumers in 1963 of approximately \$20 billion compared to 1949.

As everyone knows, only a relatively small part of the Department of Agriculture appropriation finds its way directly to farmers. Less than \$3 billion is programmed for price-support operations and approximately 60 percent of this will consist of nonfarm expenditures to warehousemen, transportation companies, and exporters, and to pay for food donated to needy persons. The other \$3 billion of the appropriation goes to pay for a multitude of programs and services, many of which are directly for the benefit of consumers.

Mr. Speaker, it is a reasonable conclusion that in 1963, agricultural programs did not cost consumers a cent, but saved them something more than \$20 billion compared to 15 years ago.

Because of this saving in their food bill, city and town families are able to spend more for the education of their children, for health care, for homes and home furnishings, and for cars and recreation. How prosperous would these areas of the economy be in 1963 without the \$20 billion consumers are saving on food?

In the Wall Street Journal's Farm Message editorial, reference is made to a proposed wheat program with the declaration it would be impossible to raise the incomes of growers above currently-anticipated 1964 levels without boosting the price of bread to consumers. The legislation recently developed by the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee opens the avenue for better farm returns than would be possible without such legislation, and at the same time protects consumers from any bread price increase resulting from wheat costs. Under this bill, millers would be paying no more for wheat than they have been paying during the past year and there would be no reason whatever for an increase in bread prices.

The Congress of the United States was not just looking for something to do when it tried to create some farm programs in the 1920's and when it succeeded in creating them in the 1930's. It

was acting in response to human and economic needs.

The Congress, from time to time, has updated these programs in response to changing conditions—and the need to update some of them again was made clear in the President's farm message.

Mr. Speaker, the story of food and agriculture in the United States of America is not the story of failure written in the editorial columns of the Wall Street Journal. It is a story of achievement, and the achievement is a blessing to every American consumer and the envy of all the world.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ROLLCALLS NOS. 1-21

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

During the first month of the 88th Congress' 2d session, which convened on January 7, I remained in the 25th District conducting an extensive series of public report meetings with constituents. Contact with the people in open and frank face-to-face discussions is to me one of the most essential features of government by, of, and for the people. My report meetings had two basic aims: to thoroughly acquaint constituents with my record during the first session, to give them an opportunity to present their views regarding the representation they received; and to get the benefit of their thinking on matters of major consequence which are likely to come before the Congress in 1964.

In a normal congressional year such meetings would have been possible during adjournment between sessions. But 1963 was not a normal year. It was the fifth longest session in the Nation's history, stretching from January 9 through December 30—356 days. It would have been a disservice to citizens of my district, I think, to have deprived them of their right of access to me simply because Congress—largely for a variety of internal reasons—failed to act with dispatch after due deliberation of issues facing the American people.

To insure that citizens had access to me—and I to them—I programmed 152 congressional report meetings during January, holding 6 meetings a day during the week and 8 meetings on Saturdays. The meeting places were carefully selected throughout the district so constituents would not have to drive miles to attend. Every registered voter received an invitation—printed at my expense—advising him of the time and place a meeting would be held in his neighborhood. In addition, every voter received—at my expense—a 12-page booklet containing my complete voting

record through December 4, my attendance record on quorum calls during this period, and explanations of why I voted as I did on legislation which I thought to be of greatest significance.

Equipped with this written and detailed report, the people knew exactly what I did, where I stood and why. And because they had this information, it was for me—and I hope for them—an exhilarating experience in the exercise of democracy when we met face to face. It was people-to-people government in the highest sense.

During the days that I spent with my constituents in the district, the House had 14 quorum calls and 7 rollcalls. The latter covered votes on amendments to the Federal Airport Act (S. 1153); amendments to the Library Services Act (H.R. 4879), and amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act (H.R. 6041). On final passage of each of these measures the voting balance ranged from 27 to 1 to 3 to 1 in favor. On these final votes my presence in the House would not have affected the outcome of the proposals, one way or the other. As these measures made their way to the floor, I kept in close telephone contact with my Washington office to determine whether an issue was likely to be decided by a handful of Members. Had I been present during final voting on these bills, I would have voted "yea" on each of them.

On January 31, with only one more round of Saturday congressional report meetings to go, I flew to Washington to be present for debate and voting on the Civil Rights Act. My wife filled in for me at Saturday's meetings, and I rescheduled these report sessions for February 15, when I was in my district during the Lincoln Day recess.

ROLLCALL NO. 32

CIVIL RIGHTS

The most comprehensive civil rights bill in the Nation's history passed the House by a margin of better than 2 to 1 after 9 days of debate on 140 proposed amendments. Credit for the bill's success must go to 138 Republicans and 152 Democrats who repeatedly warded off southern attempts to cripple the measure. But as they went down to defeat, outweighed by an overwhelming majority of national opinion, southern Congressmen were at all times gentlemen and statesmen. Their attitude, oration, and strategy were in the best traditions of the House.

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of public misconception regarding provisions of the civil rights bill as approved by the House. Many well-meaning Americans fear it because they have been misinformed as to what it is and what it is not. They do not understand what the bill is designed to accomplish and how. And yet the bill deserves to be understood and supported by all citizens who hold allegiance to the American heritage of freedom, who in thought, word, and deed believe "that all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

The aim of the first title of the 10-section bill is to enforce the constitutional right to vote in Federal elections,

a right guaranteed by the 15th amendment to all citizens, but a right which is being denied and thwarted with impunity by many Southern States which determine voting qualifications solely on the basis of color.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Title II makes discrimination unlawful in establishments that serve the public if their operations affect interstate commerce, or if State law requires that a business segregate or discriminate. Covered under the bill are hotels, motels, and lodging houses except those that rent less than six rooms and have an owner living on the premises. Also covered are lunch counters, soda fountains, gasoline stations, restaurants, movie houses, theaters, sports arenas, and other places of exhibition or entertainment. Private clubs are not included in the bill. Public accommodation laws are already in the statute books of 32 States—including California—and title II of the Civil Rights Act would serve to make equal access a national right.

Our late and beloved President Kennedy stated the legal argument for title II in these words:

No property owner who holds his premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of the public on grounds of race or color. Just as the law requires common carriers to serve equally all who wish their services, so it can require public accommodations to accommodate equally all segments of the general public.

Enforcement provisions provide latitude for persuasion and conciliation in public accommodations disputes and guarantee just protection for the rights of accused offenders.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Whereas places of public accommodation are usually privately owned, public facilities are generally owned by a State, county, or city and are built and maintained with public funds. Such facilities should therefore be available on an equal basis to all citizens and taxpayers. But today in many Southern counties and cities, public parks, playgrounds, community centers, libraries, and so forth, are closed to Negroes. Title III is designed to provide legal assistance from the U.S. Attorney General to persons who are deprived of the 14th amendment's "equal protection of the laws" by being denied equal access to and full use of public facilities. If the Attorney General finds that an aggrieved party cannot bear the financial burden of filing and maintaining a lawsuit, the Federal Government can bring court action on his behalf. The Attorney General is also empowered to intervene in—but not to initiate—suits seeking relief from denial of "equal protection" in areas other than public facilities. Presumably this would involve cases of alleged denial of the rights of assembly, petition, free speech, and so forth.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Title IV is designed to speed up the school desegregation process which has been moving at a snail's pace since the Supreme Court decision 10 years ago. At the present rate, school desegregation in many Southern cities will not be completed for at least another century. The

U.S. Commissioner of Education, under title IV, would be authorized to give technical assistance to school districts which ask for help in formulating and implementing desegregation plans. The Attorney General would be empowered to bring court action against school boards which fail to desegregate if aggrieved parents certify that they cannot bring their own suit because of financial reasons or fear of economic or personal reprisals.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Title V extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission for another 4 years. A product of the 1957 Rights Act, the Commission is authorized to: First, investigate complaints of denial of voting rights because of race or religion; second, study segregationist legal maneuvers aimed at denial of "equal protection under the laws"; and third, evaluate Federal activity regarding the 14th amendment's "equal protection" clause. Title V would also broaden the Commission's area of activity by permitting it to serve as a national information clearinghouse on equal protection in employment, education, housing, voting, transportation, and so forth. In addition, the Commission could investigate complaints of voting frauds allegedly perpetrated because of a citizen's race.

FEDERAL FUNDS

Title VI is designed to overcome one of the greatest ironies of the Nation's racial problem: the support and promotion of discrimination by funds of a Federal Government which has ruled that discrimination is in violation of the Constitution. Many hospitals, for example, constructed and equipped with Federal funds under the Hill-Burton Act, either do not accept Negro patients or segregate those that are accepted, and deny Negro doctors staff privileges. Many universities and research facilities working on projects financed by the Federal Government close their doors to Negroes. Many schools built and maintained with Federal funds under the impacted areas program are operated on a segregated basis. Many Negro children are being denied participation in federally financed school lunch programs. Many Negro families are being denied surplus commodities provided by the Department of Agriculture. Many Negroes are being denied access to housing built under urban renewal programs. The list goes on and on.

Title VI declares that discrimination in any program receiving Federal financial assistance is contrary to public policy. Federal agencies are authorized, but not required, to withhold Federal funds after notice, hearings, and persuasive efforts to obtain voluntary compliance have failed. The agency must also submit a report to the Congress. An order to cut off funds must be approved by the President, but penalized State and local agencies may appeal the action in Federal courts.

I am hopeful that in most cases the goals of Title VI can be achieved without resorting to actual cutoff of funds. Two years ago, for example, several Southern universities agreed to admit qualified Negroes to summer programs financed un-

der the National Defense Education Act, rather than face the loss of Federal aid. Several years ago a veterans hospital in Mississippi opened its doors to Negroes rather than have no hospital at all. This year several schools in Florida and Texas, built and maintained under the impacted areas program, admitted Negro children rather than lose Federal funds. In any event, when persuasion and administrative efforts fail to bring compliance, funds will be withheld only from a county or area immediately involved in a specific Federal program. Aid would not necessarily be halted to an entire State.

MISCELLANEOUS

Title VIII directs the Census Bureau to compile registration and voting statistics by race, color, and national origin in areas designated by the Civil Rights Commission for congressional elections since January 1960. Such information could presumably be used as a basis for reducing House representation, pursuant to the 14th amendment, for States which deny the equal right to vote. The bill's last two titles provide for appeal procedure in State courts and authorize necessary funds for carrying out provisions of the act.

MORALLY RIGHT

With the exception of the last three titles, provisions of the bill have already been written into California law with a corresponding positive effect upon the State's 18 million residents. California has been a pioneer in enlightened race relations and has set an excellent example for the Nation to follow. There is nothing in H.R. 7152 which will be new to Californians.

In my judgment, the provisions of the Civil Rights Act are morally right, intellectually sound, legally correct, and socially necessary. I believe that the Declaration of Independence is more than a justification of rebellion. It is also a statement of the American democratic creed. It is designed to justify the past and chart the future—and the future is now. Today we are a Nation on trial and the jury must be the conscience of each individual. It is our opportunity to reaffirm by translating into action one of the basic truths that the Founding Fathers held to be self-evident—that all men are created equal. By so doing, we can go forward accepting the challenge and sharing the hope which President Johnson has enunciated so eloquently—that the world will not narrow into a neighborhood before it has broadened into a brotherhood.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Title VII, the longest and most complicated section of the civil rights bill, declares it an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire or promote, to segregate or to discriminate on the job against any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin. This title applies to labor unions and employment agencies, as well as to employers. For the first year after the effective date, employers and unions with 100 or more workers are covered. This drops to 75 the second year and 50 the third year. Thereafter,

all employers with 25 workers in industries affecting commerce will be covered. The title establishes a five-member Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to be named by the President and confirmed by the Senate. No more than three members may belong to the same political party. The Commission would be empowered to investigate complaints and go to court in civil actions to halt or prevent unlawful employment practices. Before bringing court action, however, the Commission must first investigate and then seek to end the unlawful practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

The Commission is authorized to make agreements ceding jurisdiction to State fair employment practices commissions, such as that in California and 24 other States.

Title VII is perhaps the most important section of the bill when viewed from the strong desire of 20 million Negroes to build, through their own efforts, a more secure place in American society. Statistics which show that they are being denied their right to the pursuit of happiness are impressive: The Negro unemployment rate is twice as high as the rate for whites. Negro earnings are slightly more than half as high. Many

of the better jobs are closed to Negroes altogether. Across the Nation they are victims of the last-hired, first-fired doctrine. Thus their potential contribution to American society remains unfulfilled. They contribute less to production and, therefore, have less to give toward consumption. Negroes cost society more in unemployment and welfare benefits than they would if there were no color barriers to jobs. Many opponents of the civil rights bill declare "Negroes should work to improve their economic condition." Title VII will go a long way toward giving them this opportunity.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ecclesiastes 12: 13: Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.

Eternal God, our Father, help us to appreciate more fully how sacred and wonderful is the privilege we have of engaging in a moment of prayer and yielding our minds to a mind that is infinitely wiser than our own to be instructed and guided.

We rejoice that in this quiet Lenten of prayer and meditation we may hold fellowship with a heart that is filled with love and mercy toward all the members of the human family who at times are so lonely and disquieted.

Endow us during these troubled and restless days with calm and courageous hearts and inspire us to cultivate and keep alive our faith in Thee and in the moral and spiritual values without which we have no standards and no stability, no peace and joy.

Grant that we may be eager to follow Thy ways and obey Thy will and live righteously and honestly, believing that this is Thy divine order for the universe in which we live and move and have our being.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CX—201

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space of the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM N. McLEOD, JR.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the information that William N. McLeod, Jr., a former clerk of the House District Committee, received \$2,500 in gifts as a result of his employment by that committee, should be of serious concern.

McLeod first stated he was paid \$1,500 by Don B. Reynolds, Maryland insurance broker, for legal services in connection with passage of a bill authorizing construction of the District of Columbia Stadium. Reynolds denied McLeod had performed any legal service, and McLeod then said the money was a gift.

The Washington Metropolitan Police Relief Association admits payment of \$1,000 to McLeod for his "courtesies" to the association while an employee of the House District Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it has been said this sort of gift giving is "not unusual," I urge the House Administration Committee to launch an investigation of the activities of this former employee of the House of Representatives.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring

of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, today we have, of course, the military authorization bill.

That will be followed by a resolution providing for an official picture of the House of Representatives.

On tomorrow, under consent previously granted, George Washington's Farewell Address will be read.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, and there will be called up for consideration H.R. 9419, regulation of business of selling securities.

On Tuesday the conference report, H.R. 8363, Revenue Act of 1964, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday, H.R. 8316, lack of authority of FCC to make rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast commercials, will be called up for consideration.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 5838, amending the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards, will be considered.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I make a further inquiry of the gentleman? A number of Members have expressed some concern as to how quickly on Tuesday the conference report on the Revenue Act may be called up. Do I understand correctly there will be a beginning made on the International Development Association bill?

Mr. ALBERT. At the present time that is the plan.

Mr. HALLECK. And the conference report will come up sometime along in the middle of the afternoon?

Mr. ALBERT. I would think it would not be earlier than 2 o'clock, although I do not want to be held to that. It is planned to take up the rule on the International Development Association Act first.

May I advise the gentleman that today when the legislative program has been completed, I shall ask unanimous consent to adjourn from tomorrow until Monday, and also to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business.